

from the Taliban coming in from Pakistan. It is a war zone over there, and the Secretary of Homeland Security, Janet Napolitano, has said we are going to contribute Border Patrol agents to protect the border of Afghanistan. There are already 25 there, and more are on the way.

Now, Madam Speaker, why are Border Patrol agents from the United States going to Afghanistan?

The marines and our soldiers and our troops over there can do the job. More importantly, we need the Border Patrol agents over here. "Homeland security" means that the Secretary of Homeland Security protects the American homeland, not the homeland of some other nation.

We need the help.

In fact, we need the military on our southern border. Our border is a war zone. Drugs and people and money crisscross our border with Mexico. It is a violent place. It is the third front. More recently, we have had several people murdered on the battlefield on our border. Let me relate three of those.

One of those was a 27-year-old female police chief in Mexico—right on the border with the United States. Chief Hermila Garcia was on the job for 51 days, and she was shot down, shot seven times by the drug cartels. A recent homicide on the border.

Border Patrol Agent Brian Terry was shot in the back while he was protecting our border. Ironically, he had been to Iraq and Afghanistan as a soldier, as a marine, and now he was back here, killed on our border.

Then David Hartley, a citizen, was murdered on Falcon Lake, in Texas, when he was with his wife, Tiffany, as they were viewing an old mission. Shot and killed by the drug cartels.

Our homeland is not protected adequately, and it is time that we put Border Patrol agents on our border but also that we put the National Guard on our southern border. It is the third front. Homeland Security should protect it.

And that's just the way it is.

AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Madam Speaker, today, I have a photograph of Tyler Jordan, whose father, Phillip, was a marine gunnery sergeant killed in Iraq. I saw this photograph about 5 years ago in a national paper, and I felt that I needed to have this photograph for myself to be able to be reminded of war and the pain of war.

On Tuesday, I had the privilege and humbling experience to visit the wounded warriors at Walter Reed. I saw the pain these heroes were experiencing from the severe injuries they received fighting for this country. That's why today I show you the photograph

of Tyler Jordan's pain as he holds a folded flag at his father's funeral. This boy's pain and the pain of the heroes at Walter Reed are the reasons I've joined my colleagues in both parties in asking President Obama to bring our troops home.

Madam Speaker, this country has many problems. Maybe I am wrong, but sadly, it seems to me, the war in Afghanistan seems to be on the back burner.

Before Christmas, I read from a Washington Post article that quoted President Karzai as saying he now has three main enemies—the Taliban, the United States and the international community. He said in that article that, if he had to choose sides today, he would choose the Taliban.

There have been many articles written questioning the success of our troops in Afghanistan, but our troops have been successful. So why keep them in a country, risking their lives, when the President of that country supports the enemy?

The Afghan Government is corrupt. Not one American life should be sacrificed for such a dysfunctional, corrupt government.

In mid-December, President Obama released a review of the American strategy in Afghanistan that painted a positive picture of the progress being made there. This review is, at best, dubious. I agree with two national intelligence reports that were also released with a more realistic, negative assessment on the state of the war and our chance for success.

As I have said before, we are spending approximately \$7 billion a month, which is \$234 million a day, to fight a winless war for a corrupt government. Why do we continue to spend \$234 million a day so that some other child has to know Tyler's pain?

In closing, I would like to ask God, as I do every day on the floor when I speak, to please bless our men and women in uniform. I ask God to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform. I ask God, in his loving arms, to hold the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq.

I ask God, please bless this House and Senate that we will do what is right in the eyes of God for the American people; and I will ask God to give wisdom, strength, and courage to the President of the United States that he will do what is right in the eyes of the American people.

And I will say three times: God, please, God please, God, please continue to bless America.

□ 1430

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FRANKS of Arizona addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE PEOPLE'S HOUSE SHOULD LISTEN TO THE PEOPLE: BRING OUR TROOPS HOME FROM AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, this week as the 112th Congress begins, there is a lot of talk from the Republicans about ending business as usual and doing things differently than before. But for all the supposed change afoot, there's one critical matter on which the new majority is fully embracing the status quo—the war in Afghanistan that is now nearly a decade old. This war has been going on so long that 55 percent of my colleagues weren't here when it started.

We've heard plenty about changing the House rules, about changing the way we conduct the Nation's business, about changing the relationship between the government and the people. We've even heard about how a new law that will provide affordable health care to all Americans is somehow the greatest threat to the Republic and the constitutional order.

But on the subject of war—a disastrous war that has taken the lives of more than 1,400 Americans in Afghanistan and cost taxpayers some \$366 billion—the new congressional majority is interested in no change whatsoever.

In his speech yesterday, Speaker BOEHNER spoke of giving government back to the people. In his speech he talked about honesty, accountability, and responsiveness. Look, if he meant that, he should be listening to the 60 percent of people who believe the war in Afghanistan is not worth fighting. A clear majority of Americans realize what so many in Washington refuse to acknowledge—that this war represents an epic failure, a national embarrassment, and a moral blight on our Nation.

On this matter of life and death, this issue that will determine how history judges the United States, most of the Representatives in the House, in the people's House at that, have told the people that their point of view doesn't matter, that we know better than what they know. As usual, the people are way ahead of their policymakers, just as they were 4 years ago on Iraq. They may hear reassuring platitudes from Washington about how we're on track, but they can see the news for themselves. They can see that the security situation is in decline, that casualties are up, that the Taliban is strong, and that Afghan governance is ineffective at the very best and corrupt at the worst.

So I can't think of anything more patronizing than to tell them not to worry their pretty little heads about the war, that us grown-ups in Washington have it all taken care of. We're not bowing before them, Madam Speaker; we're sticking our finger in their eyes.

Do we truly believe it's about them and not us? Do we truly believe that we are caretakers whose only legitimacy derives from our employers who elected us? If that's true, then it's time for the Representatives of the people's House to start listening to the people.

With that, it's time to bring our troops home.

SPENDING CUTS IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. AKIN. Madam Speaker, I appreciate an opportunity to talk about a subject that I think has been on a lot of Americans' minds over particularly the last couple of years, and it's the subject of spending cuts in the Federal Government.

Now, unless people are perhaps tuned in to some other planet, they realize that the Federal Government is spending more money than we take in, and so we're running all of these deficits. Therefore, the idea is that we need to do some spending cuts. So that's what we wanted to talk about here for a little while, and I'm joined by some good friends and some very trusted Congressmen on this subject.

Just to try to frame what we're talking about a little bit—and I usually have some charts to go along with this, but the charts haven't been printed yet—if you take a look, these are pretty simple numbers. If you take a look at the spending projection for 2011, it's \$3.834 trillion, and the income projection is \$2.567 trillion. The two numbers aren't the same, as you notice, and basically we're spending more than a trillion, close to a trillion, trillion and a half dollars that we don't have. And that suggests, for most Americans that have some level of common sense, that we're going to have to make some cuts in spending. So that's the overall subject, and I think it's one that gets everybody's attention and that we need to give some thought to.

Now, obviously, right off the beginning of the bat, the new party, the Republicans, are running the House, and we're trying to start off setting a good note in being fiscally responsible. There's a fund that's allocated to each Congressman for them to run their office, to make their airplane flights, to pay phone bills, and things like that. We cut that 5 percent just as, in the sense, an indication of the fact that we're serious about doing this spending cut. That certainly doesn't get us to where we have to go, but at least it's a start.

There are a number of different ways we can approach this subject, but one of the other things that we'll be voting on this week, aside from the 5 percent cut in congressional budgets, is the fact that we want to get rid of this tre-

mendously expensive government takeover of the health care in America. It's known as ObamaCare, I suppose. And I'm joined by good friend who has joined me on the floor many times in the past 2 years, a medical doctor from Georgia, Dr. GINGREY, and he is somebody who knows, inside and out, not only the medical profession but this bill which has the government taking over all of health care.

Now, as you can imagine, that would be expensive. It would be expensive to American citizens. It would be expensive to businesses and expensive to the Federal Government. So, one place we can start talking about spending cuts is what we'll be voting on before too long, which is to get rid of this government takeover of health care, and for that reason, I would like to recognize my good friend, Dr.—Congressman—GINGREY from Georgia.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Missouri yielding, and I know that when he was referring to my medical expertise in regard to knowing that subject inside and out, no pun was intended when he mentioned that.

I do know a lot more about health care, probably, than I do about government spending, but one thing's for sure, Madam Speaker, as the gentleman pointed out: We are spending way too much money. And I think the figures today, this year, last year, we spent a third more than we took in. I mean, you know, we have a revenue stream from taxation of the American people, and yet we went beyond that by \$1 trillion of borrowed money; and, of course, of the nondomestic creditors, the largest one is China. They hold a lot of our debt. They happen to be, now, the second largest economy in the world at \$9 trillion GDP.

We had about a \$15 trillion GDP, but the thing that is so scary and frightening about that is we owe \$14 trillion. So our debt to GDP ratio is approaching 100 percent. So, you know, when we stand up, Madam Speaker, as we're doing right now and talk about this issue, we're almost in panic, and we should be because we're right on the precipice, right on the edge of becoming part of the PIGS acronym—Portugal, Italy, Ireland, Greece, Spain.

□ 1440

And, you know, we point the finger at them. But goodness gracious, it's like the Bible scripture that I'm sure the Representative from Missouri probably knows by heart. But it goes something like, If you've got a plank in your own eye, you shouldn't be pointing out the speck in somebody else's. We've got a plank in our own eye. And this is why in this 112th Congress, we have a huge challenge, don't we, my colleagues? We have a huge challenge. We're up to it. We're up to it, and I hope that we are going to be up to it on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. AKIN. So let's say that we get what you've been working for, and let's

just say by some great miracle that we were able to stop that ObamaCare. Now that would save a whole, whole lot of money, wouldn't it, in terms of—

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Well, reclaiming the time that the gentleman yielded to me, Madam Speaker. Absolutely. The gentleman from Washington, our esteemed colleague, a physician, Mr. MCDERMOTT was on the floor a little earlier talking about, well, what we were trying to do in repealing ObamaCare, or the formal recognition of that bill, Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Mr. AKIN. I call it socialized medicine. That's easier, but go ahead.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. That's a lot easier, socialized medicine, Madam Speaker; but that's essentially what it is. That is essentially what the former majority party was pushing towards.

But the gentleman who spoke said, Well, it's a stunt. These Republicans know they can't repeal ObamaCare. And, furthermore, even if they did, it would be at a cost of \$200 billion. And what I pointed out to him, Madam Speaker, as he was leaving the floor was, You know, that's really interesting. It's going to cost us \$200 billion, if that's accurate, to repeal while it cost us \$1.1 trillion to enact. So you can literally go broke saving money, can't you. And by golly, we're going to repeal it because that's what the American people want.

If we fall short in our efforts, despite 110 percent on this side of the aisle or, well, in this body and in the other body, then we have a backup plan B. And I know my colleagues would like to talk about that.

So I will yield back to the gentleman from Missouri, and let's continue the discussion.

Mr. AKIN. Well, I appreciate your medical expertise and your overview. Obviously, if the Federal Government isn't jumping into taking over all of health care, there is going to be a lot more in the private sector. We will maybe get into that a little bit about what really should the Federal Government be doing, and what should we allow States to do, and what should we allow the free market economy to do.

It seems like the way things are working today, we've got Georgia very well represented. And Congressman TOM GRAVES from Georgia has joined us before on the floor. You always have an interesting and articulate perspective. This is kind of a pet topic for a lot of us that think that government isn't a servant anymore, but it's the master. So if you say, Hey, let's start cutting government, that's kind of an interesting topic. I would like you to join us, please, TOM.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Well, I thank the gentleman from Missouri. And you're right. I mean, today, what a breath of fresh air to hear the syllables of the Constitution recited from Members all throughout this body, leading into this topic and this discussion because we really want to address